

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-20 are active.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to define the film-forming agent in accordance with Claim 3.

Claim 4 is amended to capitalize "The" in line 1.

Claim 18 is amended to provide the preamble subject matter.

No new matter is added.

The Examiner has newly rejected the claims as obvious in view of U.S. 4,090,984 to Lin (previously cited and see the present specification at page 2, lines 20-27) combined with U.S. 6,086,791 to Miller and U.S. 3,406,126 to Litant. The Examiner finds that Lin generally teaches the claimed composition but not 44 to 75% of electrically conducting particles wherein at least 15% of the particles have a flake or needle shape as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, the Examiner cites to Miller and Litant because each of these document teach conductive coatings with carbon pigments having a flake like structure (see page 3 of the Official Action). The Examiner view Lin's teachings of the content of carbon black identified in column 2, lines 31-35 in an amount of about 20-40 parts per 100 parts by wt to be close enough to 44% (the lower limit that we claim) to make the claims obvious (see page 4, 1st paragraph of the Official Action).

Regarding the limitation added to Claims 1 and 9, i.e., from Claim 3, the Examiner finds that Lin teaches the inclusion of a polyacrylate emulsion (see col. 1, lines 40-45 and 60-64) as being the same as that defined in Claim 3 (see Official Action at page 5). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Indeed, Lin discloses polyacrylates, which are polymers obtained by polymerization of monomers which are esters of acrylic acid and alcohol (for example copolymers of

alkylacrylate and acrylonitrile, in particular ethylacrylate, see col. 1, lines 48 and 55). On the contrary, polyacrylics (defined in the claims) are polymers obtained by polymerization of acrylic acid. Polyacrylates and polyacrylics are different.

Further, Applicants take issue with the underlying presumption of the combination of Line, Miller and Litant and submit that the reasons for combining the citations clearly was arrived in hindsight because certainly the motivation could not have been derived from the references themselves when considered in terms of what Miller and Litant actually teach.

Miller describes a paint (col. 2, line 66) to be applied on various substrates, for example floors, walls, ceilings, roof, gutter, outdoor structures, home/commercial appliances (col. 3, lines 1-21). Miller does not provide any salient teachings as to coatings on glass strands or glass strand structures according to present Claim 1.

In Miller's examples, the paint is applied on a glass pan or dish, or a metal pan. Furthermore, Miller's paint includes a large quantity of solvent (xylene) contrary to the electrically conducting coating composition according to Claim 9 which is aqueous. Therefore, Applicants find no basis to argue that one in the field of electrically conducting coating compositions on glass strands would look to Miller for any guidance whatsoever.

Litant teaches an electrically conducting composite which consists of a non-conducting moldable material having embedded therein unwoven carbon yarn filaments (col. 1, lines 15-18). In contrast, in the present claims, the glass strand and the glass strand structure are coated with an electrically conducting coating composition (not embedded therein). Litant requires that resinous or plastic materials are loaded with carbon or graphite granules in the form of either discrete particles or flakes to impart primary thermal conductivity to the base non-conductive matrix. Applicants find no basis to argue that one in the field of electrically conducting coating compositions on glass strands would look to Litant for any guidance whatsoever.

Therefore, reaching into Litant and Miller to include features of the present invention in the teachings of Lin must only have been done in hindsight in view of the fact that both Miller and Litant have nothing to do with the subject matter Applicants claim.

Furthermore, as explained in the background of the application in prior electrically conducting coating compositions the amount of conducting particles was relatively low achieving only low levels of electrical conductivity. Thus, the invention sought to improve the electrical conductivity by enabling the use of higher amounts of electrically conducting particles and optionally including doping agents to increase the conductivity (see page 9, starting at line 19 and pages 2-3).

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

There being no further issues, a Notice of Allowance is also requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Daniel J. Pereira, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,518

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)